



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/066,465	01/30/2002	Boyd "H". Timothy	6647-30	3498

45842 7590 07/23/2010
MARGER JOHNSON & MCCOLLOM, P.C. - NOVELL
210 SW MORRISON STREET
SUITE 400
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER

PATEL, MANGLESH M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

07/23/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@techlaw.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/066,465

Applicant(s)

TIMOTHY ET AL.

Examiner

MANGLESH M. PATEL

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 May 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38, 47 and 53-55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38, 47 and 53-55 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/10/10
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This **FINAL** action is responsive to the IDS and response filed on 5/10/2010.
2. In the response claims 1-38, 47 and 53-55 remain pending. Claims 1, 16, 31, 47 & 53-54 are the independent claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 5/10/2010 has been entered, and considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-38, 47 and 53-55 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burget (U.S. 6,557,005, filed Sep. 12, 2000, previously cited in the action dated 10/31/08) in view of Szondy (U.S. Pub 2002/0078253, filed Dec. 20, 2000).

Regarding Independent claim 1, An apparatus for presenting content to a user, comprising: A plurality of layout strings files; A plurality of layout information

files to describe how a layout string is displayed for a unique combination of a language and a device; A computer to store the layout strings files and the layout information files.

Burget discloses a plurality of layout string files as text in different languages residing in a language database (fig 1, numeral 101, column 5, lines 1-15). He discloses a plurality of layout information files to describe how a layout string or text in different language is displayed using templates residing within a template database (column 4, lines 45-67). Furthermore the layout string files and information files reside within a computer (column 4, lines 45-50). Burget also discloses a ranked list of languages as indexed in the database (see fig 1). Burget discloses that the templates describe the layout for a language but fails to explicitly disclose the layout for a device. Szondy however explicitly discloses assembling translation documents based on determined device capabilities (paragraphs 4-5 & 12-14). Based on the teachings of Szondy it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the template database of Burget to include the translation documents of Szondy. The motivation for doing so would be to display language based translations for devices with limited display capabilities.

Regarding Dependent claim 2, Burget discloses wherein each of the layout strings files stores the layout string in a language (abstract, fig 1, column 4, lines

40-67 & column 5, lines 1-40, including the explanation provided in the Independent claim).

Regarding Dependent claim 3, Burget discloses A resource file map to store at least two combinations of a layout information file and languages in which the layout strings files store the layout strings (see column 5, lines 10-17, wherein the resource file map resides within the sever computer and is used to assemble the transformed document a web form with a combination of the language and layout information); Burget also discloses a ranked list of languages as indexed in the database (see fig 1). Burget discloses A selector to select one of the plurality of layout information file and one layout strings file based on the ranked list of languages and the resource file map (See column 4, lines 43-67, wherein the user specifies a language thereby causing the server to act as a selector for selecting a layout file and string file from the ranked list of languages).

Regarding Dependent claim 4, Burget discloses Each layout information file defines how the layout string is displayed in a different language (abstract, fig 1, column 4, lines 40-67 & column 5, lines 1-40, including the explanation provided in the Independent claim).

Regarding Dependent claim 5, Burget discloses each layout information file defines how the layout string is displayed in a different language on a different device (see column 4, lines 1-67 disclosing template files thereby representing a

layout information file that defines how the layout string is displayed in a different language on different devices as requested by the remote users); Burget discloses the resource file map stores combinations of layout information file, languages in which the layout strings files store the layout strings, and identities of devices for display of upon which the information (see column 5, lines 10-17, wherein the resource file map resides within the sever computer and is used to assemble the transformed document a web form with a combination of the language and layout information). Burget doesn't explicitly teach identities of devices for display. Szondy suggests determining identities of devices for display (paragraphs 12-14). Based on the teachings of Szondy it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the template database of Burget to include the translation documents of Szondy. The motivation for doing so would be to display language based translations for devices with limited display capabilities.

Regarding Dependent claim 6, Burget discloses that the templates describe the layout for a language but fails to explicitly disclose the layout for a device. Szondy discloses each layout information file defines how the layout string is displayed on a different device; The resource file map stores combination of layout information files, languages in which the layout strings files store the layout strings, and identifiers of devices for display of the information (See abstract paragraphs 4-5 & 12-14, including the explanation provided in the Independent claim) Based on the teachings of Szondy it would have been obvious

for one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the template database of Burget to include the translation documents of Szondy. Furthermore the translation document set assembly section of Szondy (paragraphs 12-14) represents a resource file map because it identifies valid combinations of templates/translation documents for the layout string or content including the identities of the devices (based on received header information). The motivation for doing so would be to display language based translations for devices with limited display capabilities.

Regarding Dependent claim 7, Burget that the resource file map stores information about context-dependent data not stored in the layout information files or the layout strings files (see column 5, lines 10-17, wherein the resource file map resides within the sever computer and is used to assemble the transformed document a web form with a combination of the language and layout information and further containing context-dependent data not stored in the files such as the data entry information appended to the form).

Regarding Dependent claim 8, Burget discloses wherein each layout strings file includes a layout string in one language (abstract, fig 1, column 4, lines 40-67 & column 5, lines 1-40, including the explanation provided in the Independent claim).

Regarding Dependent claim 9, Burget discloses wherein at least one layout information file specifies a placement for the layout string on the default device (abstract, fig 1, column 4, lines 40-67 & column 5, lines 1-40, including the explanation provided in the Independent claim).

Regarding Dependent claim 10, Burget discloses wherein each layout strings file includes a language image in the language (abstract, fig 1, column 4, lines 40-67 & column 5, lines 1-40, including the explanation provided in the Independent claim).

Regarding Dependent claim 11, Burget discloses wherein at least one layout information file specifies a placement for the language image on the default device (abstract, fig 1, column 4, lines 40-67 & column 5, lines 1-40, including the explanation provided in the Independent claim).

Regarding Dependent claim 12, Burget discloses means for selecting one of the plurality of layout information files and one layout strings file based on a ranked list of languages (abstract, fig 1, column 4, lines 40-67 & column 5, lines 1-40, including the explanation provided in the Independent claim).

Regarding Dependent claim 13, Burget discloses a device to display the layout string according to the layout information files, thereby presenting the layout

string to user (abstract, fig 1, column 4, lines 40-67 & column 5, lines 1-40, including the explanation provided in the Independent claim).

Regarding Dependent claim 14, Burget discloses wherein the layout information files describe how content and the layout string are displayed (abstract, fig 1, column 4, lines 40-67 & column 5, lines 1-40, including the explanation provided in the Independent claim).

Regarding Dependent claim 15, Burget discloses a device to display the content and the layout string according to the layout information files, thereby presenting the content to the user (abstract, fig 1, column 4, lines 40-67 & column 5, lines 1-40, including the explanation provided in the Independent claim).

Regarding Independent claim 16, A computer-implemented method for displaying content to a user, comprising: Locating a layout information file from a plurality of information files specifying how a layout string is to be presented to the user for a unique combination of a language and a device; Locating one of a plurality of layout strings files storing the layout string; Presenting the layout string to the user according to the located layout information file.

Burget discloses a plurality of layout string files as text in different languages residing in a language database (fig 1, numeral 101, column 5, lines 1-15). He discloses a plurality of layout information files to describe how a layout string or

text in different language is displayed using templates residing within a template database (column 4, lines 45-67). Furthermore the layout string files and information files reside within a computer (column 4, lines 45-50). Burget also discloses a ranked list of languages as indexed in the database (see fig 1). Burget discloses that the templates describe the layout for a language but fails to explicitly disclose the layout for a device. Szondy however explicitly discloses assembling translation documents based on determined device capabilities (paragraphs 4-5). Based on the teachings of Szondy it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the template database of Burget to include the translation documents of Szondy. The motivation for doing so would be to display language based translations for devices with limited display capabilities.

Regarding Dependent claim 17, Burget discloses Locating a layout information file includes locating a layout information file specifying how content and the layout string is to be presented to the user; Obtaining the content from a content provider; Presenting the layout string to the user includes presenting the content and the layout string to the user according to the located layout information file (abstract, fig 1, column 4, lines 40-67 & column 5, lines 1-40, including the explanation provided in the Independent claim).

Regarding Dependent claim 18, Burget discloses locating one of a plurality of layout strings files includes locating the one of the plurality of layout strings files

storing the layout string in a selected language (abstract, fig 1, column 4, lines 40-67 & column 5, lines 1-40, including the explanation provided in the Independent claim).

Regarding Dependent claim 19, Burget discloses wherein locating a layout information file from a plurality of layout information files includes locating a layout information file dependent on the selected language specifying how the content is to be presented to the user (abstract, fig 1, column 4, lines 40-67 & column 5, lines 1-40, including the explanation provided in the Independent claim).

Regarding Dependent claim 20, Burget discloses that the templates describe the layout for a language but fails to explicitly disclose the layout for a device. Szondy discloses Receiving a ranked list of languages from the user; Accessing a resource file map listing recognized combinations of layout information files and languages in which the layout strings file store the layout string; Identifying the selected language from the resource file map based on the ranked list of languages (See abstract paragraphs 4-5 & 12-14, including the explanation provided in the Independent claim) Based on the teachings of Szondy it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the template database of Burget to include the translation documents of Szondy. The motivation for doing so would be to display language based translations for devices with limited display capabilities.

Regarding Dependent claim 21, Burget discloses wherein identifying the selected language includes identifying a highest-ranked language from the ranked list of languages such that one of the plurality of layout information files and the one of the plurality of layout strings files exist for the highest-ranked language (abstract, fig 1, column 4, lines 40-67 & column 5, lines 1-40, including the explanation provided in the Independent claim).

Regarding Dependent claim 22, Burget discloses that the templates describe the layout for a language but fails to explicitly disclose the layout for a device. Szondy discloses Determining a device on which to display the content to the user; Accessing a resource file map includes accessing a resource file map listing all combinations of layout information files, languages, and devices; Identifying the selected language includes identifying the selected language from the resource file map based on the ranked list of languages and the device (See abstract paragraphs 4-5 & 12-14, including the explanation provided in the Independent claim) Based on the teachings of Szondy it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the template database of Burget to include the translation documents of Szondy. The motivation for doing so would be to display language based translations for devices with limited display capabilities.

Regarding Dependent claim 23, Burget discloses wherein locating a layout information file from a plurality of information files includes locating a default layout information file specifying how the content is to be presented to the user if the resource file map does not specify a combination including a particular layout information file and at least one of the device or one of the languages in the ranked list of languages (abstract, fig 1, column 4, lines 40-67 & column 5, lines 1-40, including the explanation provided in the Independent claim).

Regarding Dependent claim 24, Burget discloses that the templates describe the layout for a language but fails to explicitly disclose the layout for a device. Szondy discloses wherein locating a layout information file from a plurality of layout information files includes locating a default layout information file specifying how the content is to be presented to the user if the resource file map does not specify a combination including a particular layout information file and one of the languages in the ranked list of languages (See abstract paragraphs 4-5 & 12-14, including the explanation provided in the Independent claim) Based on the teachings of Szondy it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the template database of Burget to include the translation documents of Szondy. The motivation for doing so would be to display language based translations for devices with limited display capabilities.

Regarding Dependent claim 25, Burget discloses that the templates describe the layout for a language but fails to explicitly disclose the layout for a device.

Szondy discloses Accessing a resource file map includes accessing a resource file map storing information about other context-dependent data; Presenting the content and the layout string to the user includes presenting the other context-dependent data to the user according to the layout information file (See abstract paragraphs 4-5 & 12-14, including the explanation provided in the Independent claim) Based on the teachings of Szondy it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the template database of Burget to include the translation documents of Szondy. The motivation for doing so would be to display language based translations for devices with limited display capabilities.

Regarding Dependent claim 26, Burget discloses that the templates describe the layout for a language but fails to explicitly disclose the layout for a device. Szondy discloses determining a device on which to display the content to the user (See abstract paragraphs 4-5 & 12-14, including the explanation provided in the Independent claim) Based on the teachings of Szondy it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the template database of Burget to include the translation documents of Szondy. The motivation for doing so would be to display language based translations for devices with limited display capabilities.

Regarding Dependent claim 27, Burget discloses wherein locating a layout information file includes locating the layout information file specifying how the

content is to be presented to the user on the device (abstract, fig 1, column 4, lines 40-67 & column 5, lines 1-40, including the explanation provided in the Independent claim).

Regarding Dependent claim 28, Burget discloses that the templates describe the layout for a language but fails to explicitly disclose the layout for a device. Szondy discloses wherein locating the one of the plurality of layout strings files further includes locating the one of the plurality of the layout strings files storing device-dependent layout string (See abstract paragraphs 4-5 & 12-14, including the explanation provided in the Independent claim) Based on the teachings of Szondy it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the template database of Burget to include the translation documents of Szondy. The motivation for doing so would be to display language based translations for devices with limited display capabilities.

Regarding Dependent claim 29, Burget discloses wherein presenting the content and the layout string includes presenting the content and the layout string to the user on the device according to the located layout information file (abstract, fig 1, column 4, lines 40-67 & column 5, lines 1-40, including the explanation provided in the Independent claim).

Regarding Dependent claim 30, Burget discloses Locating a second layout information file specifying how a second content is to be presented to the user;

Locating a second of the layout strings files storing a second layout string;
Presenting the content and the layout string includes presenting the content, the second content, the layout string, and the second layout string to the user according to the layout information file and the second layout information file (abstract, fig 1, column 4, lines 40-67 & column 5, lines 1-40, including the explanation provided in the Independent claim).

Regarding Independent claim 31, content to a user, comprising: Location software to locate a layout information file from a plurality of layout information files specifying how a layout string is to be presented to the user for a unique combination of a language and a device; Location software to locate one of a plurality of layout strings files storing the layout string; Presentation software to present the layout string to the user according to the located layout information file.

Burget discloses a plurality of layout string files as text in different languages residing in a language database (fig 1, numeral 101, column 5, lines 1-15). He discloses a plurality of layout information files to describe how a layout string or text in different language is displayed using templates residing within a template database (column 4, lines 45-67). Furthermore the layout string files and information files reside within a computer (column 4, lines 45-50). Burget also discloses a ranked list of languages as indexed in the database (see fig 1). Burget discloses that the templates describe the layout for a language but fails to

explicitly disclose the layout for a device. Szondy however explicitly discloses assembling translation documents based on determined device capabilities (paragraphs 4-5). Based on the teachings of Szondy it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the template database of Burget to include the translation documents of Szondy. The motivation for doing so would be to display language based translations for devices with limited display capabilities.

Regarding Dependent claim 32, Burget discloses The location software to locate a layout information file includes location software to locate a layout information file specifying how content and the layout string are to be presented to the user; The program further comprises obtaining software to obtain the content from a content provider; The presentation software to present the layout string to the user includes presentation software to present the content and the layout string to the user according to the located layout information file (abstract, fig 1, column 4, lines 40-67 & column 5, lines 1-40, including the explanation provided in the Independent claim).

Regarding Dependent claim 33, Burget discloses wherein the location software includes location software to locate the one of the plurality of layout strings files storing the layout string in a selected language (abstract, fig 1, column 4, lines 40-67 & column 5, lines 1-40, including the explanation provided in the Independent claim).

Regarding Dependent claim 34, Burget discloses wherein the location software includes location software to locate a layout information file from the plurality of layout information files dependent on the selected language specifying how the content is to be presented to the user (abstract, fig 1, column 4, lines 40-67 & column 5, lines 1-40, including the explanation provided in the Independent claim).

Regarding Dependent claim 35, Burget discloses that the templates describe the layout for a language but fails to explicitly disclose the layout for a device. Szondy discloses s Reception software to receive a ranked list of languages from the user; Accessing software to access a resource file map listing recognized combinations of layout information files and languages in which the layout strings file store the layout string; Identification software to identify the selected language from the resource file map based on the ranked list of languages (See abstract paragraphs 4-5 & 12-14, including the explanation provided in the Independent claim) Based on the teachings of Szondy it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the template database of Burget to include the translation documents of Szondy. The motivation for doing so would be to display language based translations for devices with limited display capabilities.

Regarding Dependent claim 36, Burget discloses wherein the identification software to includes identification software to identify a highest-ranked language from the ranked list of languages such that one of the plurality of layout information files and the one of the plurality of layout strings files exist for the highest-ranked language (abstract, fig 1, column 4, lines 40-67 & column 5, lines 1-40, including the explanation provided in the Independent claim).

Regarding Dependent claim 37, Burget discloses wherein the locating software includes location software to locate a default layout information file specifying how the content is to be presented to the user if the resource file map does not specify a combination including a particular layout information file and one of the languages in the ranked list of languages (abstract, fig 1, column 4, lines 40-67 & column 5, lines 1-40, including the explanation provided in the Independent claim).

Regarding Dependent claim 38, Burget discloses Location software to locate a second layout information file specifying how a second content is to be presented to the user; Location software to locate a second of the layout strings files storing a second layout string; The presentation software includes presentation software to present the content, the second content, the layout string, and the second layout string to the user according to the layout information file and the second layout information file (abstract, fig 1, column 4, lines 40-67 & column 5, lines 1-40, including the explanation provided in the Independent claim).

Regarding Independent claim 47, A computer-implemented method for using a selected context to display content to a user, comprising: Locating a layout information file from a plurality of layout information files specifying how the content is to be presented to the user for a unique combination of a language and a device; Locating a layout strings file storing a layout string in the selected context; Presenting the content and the layout sting in the selected context to the user according to the located layout information file.

Burget discloses a plurality of layout string files as text in different languages residing in a language database (fig 1, numeral 101, column 5, lines 1-15). He discloses a plurality of layout information files to describe how a layout string or text in different language is displayed using templates residing within a template database (column 4, lines 45-67). Furthermore the layout string files and information files reside within a computer (column 4, lines 45-50). Burget also discloses a ranked list of languages as indexed in the database (see fig 1). Burget discloses that the templates describe the layout for a language but fails to explicitly disclose the layout for a device. Szondy however explicitly discloses assembling translation documents based on determined device capabilities (paragraphs 4-5). Based on the teachings of Szondy it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the template database of Burget to include the translation documents of Szondy. The motivation for doing

so would be to display language based translations for devices with limited display capabilities.

Regarding Independent claim 53, An apparatus for presenting content to a user, comprising: A file storing a plurality of layout strings sub-files and a plurality of layout information sub-files to describe how content and a layout string are displayed for a unique combination of a language and a device; A resource file map to store at least two combinations of the layout information sub-file and languages in which the layout strings sub-files store the layout strings; A computer to store the file and the resource file map; A ranked list of languages; A selector to select one of the plurality of layout information sub-files and one layout strings sub-file based on the ranked list of languages and the resource file map.

Burget discloses a plurality of layout string files as text in different languages residing in a language database (fig 1, numeral 101, column 5, lines 1-15). He discloses a plurality of layout information files to describe how a layout string or text in different language is displayed using templates residing within a template database (column 4, lines 45-67). Furthermore the layout string files and information files reside within a computer (column 4, lines 45-50). Burget also discloses a ranked list of languages as indexed in the database (see fig 1). Burget discloses the resource file map stores combinations of layout information file, languages in which the layout strings files store the layout strings, and identities

of devices for display of upon which the information (see column 5, lines 10-17, wherein the resource file map resides within the sever computer and is used to assemble the transformed document a web form with a combination of the language and layout information).Burget discloses that the templates describe the layout for a language but fails to explicitly disclose the layout for a device. Szondy however explicitly discloses assembling translation documents based on determined device capabilities (paragraphs 4-5). Based on the teachings of Szondy it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the template database of Burget to include the translation documents of Szondy. The motivation for doing so would be to display language based translations for devices with limited display capabilities.

Regarding Independent claim 54, a first directory storing at least two layout strings files, each layout strings file storing a layout string in a language; A second directory storing at least one layout information file for a first combination of a language and a device, the layout information file designed to be combined with one of the layout strings files and content to display the layout string and the content to a user in a selected language on the device; A Third directory storing at least one layout information file for a second combination of a language and a second device, the layout information file designed to be combined with one of the layout strings files and the content to display the layout string and the content to the user in the selected language on the second device; A resource file map

identifying valid combinations of layout information files and language which the layout strings files store layout strings for the device.

Burget discloses a plurality of layout string files as text in different languages residing in a language database (fig 1, numeral 101, column 5, lines 1-15). He discloses a plurality of layout information files to describe how a layout string or text in different language is displayed using templates residing within a template database (column 4, lines 45-67). Furthermore the layout string files and information files reside within a computer (column 4, lines 45-50). Burget also discloses a ranked list of languages as indexed in the database (see fig 1). Burget discloses the resource file map stores combinations of layout information file, languages in which the layout strings files store the layout strings, and identities of devices for display of upon which the information (see column 5, lines 10-17, wherein the resource file map resides within the sever computer and is used to assemble the transformed document a web form with a combination of the language and layout information).Burget discloses that the templates describe the layout for a language but fails to explicitly disclose the layout for a device. Szondy however explicitly discloses assembling translation documents based on determined device capabilities (paragraphs 4-5). Based on the teachings of Szondy it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the template database of Burget to include the translation documents of Szondy. The motivation for doing so would be to display language based translations for devices with limited display capabilities.

Regarding Dependent claim 55, Burget discloses that the templates describe the layout for a language but fails to explicitly disclose the layout for a device. Szondy discloses wherein the resource file map further identifies valid combinations of layout information files in the third directory and languages in which the layout strings files store layout strings for the second device (See abstract paragraphs 4-5 & 12-14, including the explanation provided in the Independent claim) Based on the teachings of Szondy it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the template database of Burget to include the translation documents of Szondy. The motivation for doing so would be to display language based translations for devices with limited display capabilities.

It is noted that any citation [[s]] to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. [[See, MPEP 2123]]

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant arguments filed 5/10/2010 have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

Applicant Argues: Burget does not teach or suggest at least “a plurality of layout strings files” (pg 11, paragraph 3)

Burget does not teach or suggest at least “a plurality of layout information files describing how a layout string is displayed for a unique combination of a language and a device”. Burget also fails to teach or suggest “a computer to store the layout strings files and the layout information files” (pg 12, paragraphs 1 & 2)

Nothing in Burget teaches separate files such that each file stores a layout string in a language; rather, Burget simply discloses a language database 101 that contains counterpart text elements. (pg 12, paragraph 6)

The Examiner Respectfully Disagrees: Burget teaches a plurality of layout string files which is text in different languages in the language database (column 5, lines 1-15). The template database in column 4, lines 49-57 is a plurality of layout information files and specifies layout of the web form. Furthermore the template specifies how a layout string is displayed for a language but not for a device. Szondy discloses this feature of assembling translation documents based on determined device capabilities (paragraphs 4-5). The layout strings and information files are stored in a database and Burget discloses “these databases could be internal to the server or resident on other computers that communicate with the server” (column 4, lines 45-50). Thereby teaching a computer to store the layout strings and the layout information files. The elements are stored based on

the language type thereby being separate files storing layout strings in a language such as English or Japanese (see column 5, lines 1-10).

Applicant Argues: There is no mention of anything that could possibly be construed as the recited resource file map. (pg 13, paragraph 1)

However, neither the cited figure nor any other portion of Burget teaches anything pertaining to any type of ranked list, let alone a ranked list of languages or selecting one of a plurality of layout information files and one layout strings file based on the ranked list of languages.(pg 13, paragraph 2)

The Examiner Respectfully Disagrees: Burget discloses a resource file map which is how the server performs the assembly of the template data and the data from a language database when requested thereby generating a web form. A mapping is required to combine the different data sources to generate the form in the correct language requested by a user (see column 5, lines 10-25). The languages are ranked as stored in a database with an ordering as determined by the type of language.

Applicant Argues: However, nothing in Burget teaches or suggests anything pertaining to obtaining content from a content provider. (pg 14, paragraph 4)

Art Unit: 2178

The Examiner Respectfully Disagrees: Burget teaches that as a remote user using the system to generate the form in a desired language this content is obtained from a content provider not from the remote users computing system (column 4, lines 22-35).

It is not necessary that the references actually suggest, expressly or in so many words the changes or improvements that applicant has made. The test for combining references is what the references as a whole would have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art. In re Sheckler, 168 USPQ 716 (CCPA 1971); In re McLaughlin 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971); In re Young 159 USPQ 725 (CCPA 1968).

One cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., Inc., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Manglesh M. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-5937. The examiner can normally be reached on M,F 8:30-6:00 T,TH 8:30-3:00 Wed 8:30-7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571)272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 2178

Manglesh M. Patel
Patent Examiner (AU 2178)
July 16, 2010

/Manglesh M Patel/
Manglesh Patel
Examiner, Art Unit 2178

/CESAR B PAULA/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178